

Dear Board,

7/11/72

Your mailing of the 10th came this a.m. Our mail is now later, now 11th. In it are a couple of clips I'll read later, you letter to me of the 10th., confidential memo of 7/5 conversation with Sylvia, Jerry's 7/6 and your 7/6 answer. I've heard nothing further from either. This is a large volume, I'd drop in everything to read it, and if any requires response unless I make it as I read, I may not be able to. So, there may be some confusion. I was up late, thru the points of order after the delegate contest Calif., and got up at my usual hour, so I'm also tired. I had begun to read your 10, then realized the above, and in skimming what you enclosed I see you do make reference to Sylvia being hooked on amphetamines. So, you can see why I didn't send you her letter to me. I think she can be abused by misuse of this, and if Jerry doesn't know, don't tell him or anyone else. She told me and it both worried me and helped me understand. My strongest feeling about her is sorrow. It is not hate.

You do understand correctly. I did take that time in what I regard as your interest. Obviously, there is nothing else in it. But that is the way it should be, so feel no obligation. It is a responsibility and a liability of years. And affection.

You say you have had a decision to make. I thought you had at the beginning. But bear in mind that there is no vital difference either way except in your thinking of yourself.

"....considering Wecht's latest behavior not befitting anyone who calls himself a man." If you do not amplify this, when you have time, would appreciate separately. If you want confidential, write on it, as you have, and I do prefer red. Easier to spot that.

In the rest of this graph, all is normal. You were merely, as you say, beginning to mature. My concern was not with your intellectual equipment but your lack of worldly experience. With ref to your unauthorized use of my material: thanks for the candor. I'd assumed it, despite my high regard for you and your integrity. That is the chief reason I didn't want to see your ms. I'd have had to tell you about it. It is better for you that you learned this way, on your own. Straighter trunk, tree: I am also aware that this is one of the hazards of helping. I'm having to change because of the mess, but there will be only a few, and now I know I don't have to worry about you. I think you know I never really did. At your age it would have been too exceptional for you not to have been tempted as you were. I knew. I was once your age and have known many others. We are all basically alike. No ashes on the head.

Will copy and send Sh's letter. You may copy, but please return for duplicate filing.

Please also don't worry about the effects of whatever Sh does or doesn't now do. I think it would not be uncharitable, despite the difference in your ages, to have at least in the back of your mind some of the attitude you understand I've had about you. She is not inherently as bad a person as she has been with almost everything having to do with me and almost from the first. We can't use Wecht as a second-line defense after being "oh" anyway. All that remains of possible constructive use of which I can now conceive is my original plan. He never responded and I think there is now less chance. I outlined it to you, I'm sure.

Sh: One can't always separate the mental and the physical. I know too little, but I think the root with her is in the mind, not the body.

Either way on Mary is OK. My chief interest, as I now recall, was feedback from Mary who is a woman, exceedingly keen, and knows Sylvia well. They have spent some time together than I have with either. No sweat, and it is over her head now. I think it unlikely they will talk unless Sh phones her.

Your point about my trust and including strangers in it is well taken. You are not alone. Mary, Hil and even Gary agree. Yes, Gary! Two things: this is the way I am; and I may not see these people again and there is the question should I try to level as best I can. It has not often been in my mind, if ever, whether or not the result was in my interest.

I want you to reconsider you line about Wecht in the light of what you said earlier about your growth and changes that embarrass you as you mature and understand better:

"...my speaking to him does not mean I approve of what he is doing." I require no persuasion to go further, and to believe that you may even have doubts about his inner motivation. What you do or do not speak to him doesn't really trouble me either way. Think of was it JAI's words: He who is silent in the face of evil becomes part of it. I don't want you to think of it this way later. Don't let this influence you. Think and be sure. And we are not yet certain that evil is inevitable (I do now think it is in his intentions in the form of fuck-everything-but-me self-seeking), we or I think that it is probable. For my old I also see no real probable benefit aside from personal considerations.

I think you should realize that the use of some of my work is inevitable and outside your control. Remember, I also trusted him and informed and looked in confidence. There was

Moreover, you now know that some was stolen and when it was duplicated, it was duplicated from what also was stolen. Aside from this, I'm surprised you haven't reported what I have already detected, theft or misuse of more than you have told me. Let's see if you get it for yourself. I don't want to color anyway.

I'm having to rush so I may make mistakes other than in typing. But reread penult graph p. 2 and ask if you aren't really saying that you have to see to it that the head of the Academy of Forensic Sciences, a great forensic pathologist, knows forensic path.

With Jerry it is as you say. He, too, has problems, of his generation and I suspect a broken marriage and ambivalent feelings about his real father, close enough to annoy and prick conscience. I erred in considering him only unhousebroken and a mental and emotional child. I wasted much time trying to help him put his head together. Don't worry about the problems he can make for you. With whom? If he tries it with Sylvia, it may be a helpful catharsis for her. He won't really hurt you unless you waste precious time with him. Without yet reading the exchange, as a general policy I agree, as my record shows, with leaving a record, as between people, on issues and ~~records~~ for history. You know my own files are unpurged and now are unpurgable.

Perhaps you misunderstood my comment on your first to him. It was that your think was so close to identical with mine and independent. You hadn't gotten my letter when you wrote him and you were, I think, more severe than I. If it does not come up, you might want to tell him that what Gary used to duplicate my work I also gave Gary in confidence. To date no response from him on that letter. I think he will, and not like Jerry.

Glad you plodded with Ecclesiastes. It is also the most beautiful writing in the King James, if sometimes obscure, as you learned. There is much in the Old Testament.

JP's 7/6 Opening I have no intimation responding typical, and cogent to himself, too.

If you write again, note that he falls short as saying that Lifton did cite the d.o. and nudge him a bit about his own word, "advertise", and see if he can begin to think.

On the relevance of the "inck" stuff and the panel report in his Times stuff, undiluted garbage. It was ego-tripping. What he hears avoids in any statement that he knows enough to know what he is into or doing or the subject.

That jays on Wacht "ones crawling to you" is miserable even for one in his state. Asking for help is this?

Unconsciously, he forecasts a "disaster" from Wacht here, but says it would be from ignorance. Why did he apply? What could his motive been in JP's eyes?

None of Lifton's error can be attributed to ignorance of the basic evidence.

He also misrepresents me on disaster and deliberately.

On the briefing, "Harold won't do it." Now I won't. But what I told Cyril is that I'd have to wait and examine the situation when the time came, not no.

Lifton graph on "I had hoped it would save you to head him off" is like locking the barn after the horse is gone, and with Lifton it is as with some horses, as you are too young (and a city boy) to know: they learn how to unlatch doors.

Before reading you 7/8 to him, I must confess I don't think I have ever seen anything quite as self-deceptive and deliberately and fully dishonest, contradictory as this may seem. I think he may well have told Lifton about this just to hurt me and in the hope that Lifton would use. But I have published it and believe I have the legal rights to it except in its official interpretation. Jerry now has to hurt me to save himself in his own esteem.

I see you also go into "inck. I regret you didn't tell him here that I gave Wacht his testimony was his incompetency in examining the panel report required it--and that I sent to him immediately from H.O.-- and that I gave H.O. all their medical stuff, knowing the consequences.

As I think back, his attitude began to change in the writing of the article on the Times and the change is reflected in it.

To the bottom of page 3 I think you cooled off to much. He deserved harsher words.

1st graph, page 4: I've gone into this with him in detail where real danger lies. I'd rather you carry it no further. I think his twisted mind has rejected it and he may have to cope with it, so don't brief anyone any further on this or offsetting say become even more impossible.

Nothing to add except this thought: From Johnson's description Lifton might not have ordered that stuff until prodded by JP. Note my own earlier letter or today and my own belated realization. I'll comment on Sh's separately because you ask confidence and I can then files separately. Best,